

Application No.: 10/037,782
Amendment dated: August 1, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: February 12, 2003

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 12, 2003. Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments and arguments here is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 42 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112. The Examiner indicated that claim 42 recites the audio signals as being "provided to said terminal via an autodialer." Applicant respectfully submits that such a recitation likely occurred as a result of an error in typing and has amended the claim to recite a "voice generator" instead. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw her rejection of claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112.

With respect to claim 62, the Examiner indicated that claim 62, as written, lacks support. Applicant has amended claim 62 to recite that the interface structure may receive "caller customer number data" from a particular caller and "caller credit card number data" from a different caller. The specification clearly supports receiving caller customer number data as well as credit card number data from callers. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw her rejection of claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112.

In paragraph 3 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-23, 25, 46-49, 54-56, and 65-71, as being unpatentable over Szlam et al. in view of Gordon. The Examiner indicates that Szlam differs from the rejected claims in that it does not specify testing credit card number data. The Examiner contends that as Szlam is directed to a "customer" account servicing system which allows for sales transactions and Gordon teaches the well known receiving of credit card number data from new customers, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to incorporate the teaching in Gordon within Szlam's system. Applicant has further amended claim 22 to clarify that the caller data for the individual callers that is displayed at the coupled terminal is at least a part of the data entered by the callers. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Szlam nor Gordon, alone or in combination, teach this aspect of the claims. If anything, in Szlam, a caller is directly sent to an operator and the caller's calling number identification (ANI) is used to display caller information on the operator's terminal. If not the caller's ANI, a caller

Application No.: 10/037,782
Amendment dated: August 1, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: February 12, 2003

may enter some DTMF data, which is displayed first at an operator terminal. Then either automatically or in response to an operator keystroke, the operator terminal sends the collected information to the mainframe, which then, provides the full customer account information to the operator terminal. In Gordon, as well, a caller's calling number identification (ANI) is used to place an order for a pay-per-view movie.

With respect to claim 46, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not clear that Szlam and Gordon satisfy the recitation in the claim that requires storing "other data...received in the form of signals including both said digital data signals and audio signals wherein a coupled terminal is connected to said memory structure wherein said memory structure is addressed to provide other data including at least said audio data to said coupled terminal."

With respect to claim 55, Applicant has further amended claim 55 to clarify that the subsequent processing occurs "after the instant call is terminated."

The remaining rejected claims are distinct by virtue of their dependency on the independent claims that are discussed above and considered distinct from the art applied by the Examiner.

In paragraph 4 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 24, 50-53, 57-61, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 (a) in view of Szlam and Gordon, and further in view of Kauffman. Again, these claims are distinct at least for the same reasons the claims from which they depend are distinct.

In paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 26-41, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam in view of Kauffman. Claims 26 and 31 are amended to further clarify that at least a part of the caller data confirmed with the callers is provided via a voice generator. In Szlam, the operator verbally confirms caller data. The claims dependent on claims 26 and 31 are distinct for at least the same reason.

Application No.: 10/037,782
Amendment dated: August 1, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: February 12, 2003

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims pending here is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 12, 2003

9200 Sunset Blvd., Suite 1005
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-8191

Respectfully submitted,

By: Reena Kuyper

Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830